

**The Times-Dispatch**  
DAILY WEEKLY-SUNDAY  
Business Office: 115 E. Main Street  
South Richmond, Va.  
Telephone: 1110  
Lynchburg Bureau: 100 N. Sycamore Street  
Lynchburg, Va.  
Telephone: 1110  
BY MAIL: One Six Three One  
POSTAGE PAID. Year. Mo. Mo. Mo.  
Daily without Sunday: \$1.00 \$1.00 \$1.00  
Daily without Sunday: 400 200 100  
Sunday edition only: 200 100 50  
Weekly (Wednesday): 1.00 .50 .25

By Times-Dispatch Carrier Delivery Service in Richmond (and suburbs) and Petersburg.

Use Week:  
Daily without Sunday: 10 cents  
Daily without Sunday: 10 cents  
Sunday only: 6 cents

Entered January 27, 1903, at Richmond, Va., as second-class matter under act of Congress of March 3, 1879.

SATURDAY, SEPTEMBER 24, 1910.

### ROOSEVELT ON PROTECTION.

The President's Tariff Board, we are told, is now bringing its energies to bear on "Schedule K"—the woolen abomination—probably the most abominable feature of the supremely abominable Payne-Aldrich tariff measure, which the President recently characterized as the best tariff measure the country ever had, a characterization which Mr. Roosevelt reiterates in the Outlook of the 17th instant. Both Mr. Roosevelt and Mr. Taft, however, have misgivings, and the former, in his article, says that it is nevertheless true that this best of all tariffs is unsatisfactory. Like Mr. Taft, he perceives somewhat late in the day the necessity of revision, and, like Mr. Taft, he expects great things from the Tariff Board and the proposal to revise the schedules one at a time.

Mr. Roosevelt says the tariff is a moral issue; but if Mr. Roosevelt's scheme is to revise the tariff, and yet preserve inviolate the "principle" of protection, his solution of this moral issue will probably be immoral—that is to say, if it is conceded to be immoral to compel one man to surrender his property without any consideration for the use and benefit of another.

Mr. Roosevelt, curiously enough, considering his activity in all public affairs, seems to have gotten back to the doctrine reached by protectionists, so long ago exploded and laughed out of the discussion, that much of his article sounds like excerpts taken from a campaign hand book of the "seventies." He tells us that the American working man must be protected; his standard of living must be upheld; he must not be made to compete with the pauper labor of Europe, and hence the difference in the cost of production must be taken into consideration in imposing a tariff. These things must be inquired into, he says, by a commission of "well-paid experts—men who should not represent any industry, but should be masters of their subjects; of the very highest character, and who should approach the matter with an absolute disregard of every outside consideration." "These men," he continues, "should take up in succession each subject with which the tariff deals and investigate the conditions of production here and abroad; they should find out the facts, and not merely accept the statements of interested parties, and they should report to Congress on each subject as soon as that subject has been covered. Then action can be taken."

As for the tariff protecting the American working man from foreign competition, let us look at this for a moment. The production of iron and steel made possible the steel trust. When that trust was formed Mr. Carnegie and his "forty robbers" divided among themselves something in the neighborhood of a half billion dollars in stocks and bonds; paid them for a plant which would cost twelve months before they had sold an option on to Mr. Erick at one hundred and twenty-five millions of dollars, which was not taken up. It was explained at that time that whereas the plant had not represented more than about forty million dollars of actual investment, yet its earning capacity made the price of one hundred and twenty-five million asked not excessive.

Perhaps not before in the history of the world has so stupendous a profit been made by the owners of an industrial plant in the same length of time as was made by the Carnegie people in the deal with the steel trust. The steel trust itself, capitalized at some billion and a half, of which some eleven hundred and fifty million was "water," pure and simple, has within a few years made so gigantic an income over and above all expenses as to change this "water" into actual value. These colossal profits are not profits. Substantially, the protective tariff is responsible for them. Under no other conceivable system would such profits have been possible, would such fortunes have been built up in so short a time. It has no parallel in history or fiction, unless it be found in the wonders worked by the "Slave of the Lamp" in the Arabian tale.

We would be glad to learn from Mr. Roosevelt, or any one else, what part of these fabulous, unearned, protection-made profits went to keep up the American standard of living for wage-earners. They constitute the net proceeds resulting from the protection-made monopoly of the trusts, and were paid by the American consumers of the trust products. The wages and costs of production were paid before the profits were declared. And nowhere in America were worse conditions found than among the steel workers at Pittsburgh. This is merely one instance illustrating the workings of the principle of protection, which Mr. Roosevelt desires to preserve, at all costs. His Board of Experts he expects to ascertain the difference in the cost of production here and abroad,

taking each schedule one at a time. Concede that such a labor were possible of success, our great-grandchildren would probably not live long enough to see the completion of it.

Mr. Roosevelt seems to overlook the fact that the most complete answer to this waddle about the difference in cost of production here and abroad is that our producers sell their products abroad in open competition with the rest of the world, and for a less price than they charge the American consumers. Does Mr. Roosevelt or anybody else fancy that these American producers sell to Europeans at a loss? If they can transport their products across the seas and undersell foreigners in open markets, does Mr. Roosevelt think that the "American standard of living" would be reduced by compelling them to sell equally cheap to American consumers? Or will he take away their arbitrary privilege of charging Americans more than foreigners?

While he is so anxious about the standard of living for American wage earners in the protected industries being maintained, has he no desire to maintain a decent standard of living for the American consumer? Even if we should concede (what is demonstrably false) that protection maintains the American working man's high standard of living, how about those who are not engaged in the protected industries, but who have to contribute to this high standard of living laid down for others? How is their standard of living affected? A manufacturer, let us say, buys a piece of land on a river, develops water power, and manufactures bags. He expects the neighboring farmers to pay him fifteen cents for these bags, whereas they could buy them from others for ten cents. He thinks that they should be willing to pay the additional price in order that he might pay such wages to his employees as will enable them to live in comfort, and he procures legislation which will compel the farmers to pay him the high price demanded for his bags. What of the farmer? Why should he not demand that this manufacturer pay him more than the market price for his corn? Have not the farmers a right to maintain their standard of living? And if they cannot do so at their own expense, and by their legitimate labors, and honest industry, does Mr. Roosevelt think it just or moral to compel the manufacturers to pay them artificial prices, and so contribute to the style of living which would suit their taste, and which he thinks would be becoming for an American? Why should the unprotected industries contribute toward the artificial standard of living demanded for the employees of the protected industries, while they themselves are compelled to reduce their standard of living in order to make this enforced contribution?

But the claim that the tariff maintains a high standard of living for the American working man is as false as the protective principle is dishonest. If any doubt it, let them compare the standard of living in high-protection Germany, with the standard of living for the same class of laborers just across the North Sea in free-trade England. Not even the most brazen "stand-patter" would pretend that the standard is higher in Germany than it is in England. The vast natural resources of this country and the immense opportunities for labor and energy, have naturally established a high standard of living for our working men. If the tariff had had any effect upon this it has had the effect of lowering that standard by making it more difficult to purchase the comforts and daily necessities of life.

The principle of protection which Mr. Roosevelt desires to maintain inviolate is the principle of robbery. Of taking from one man for the benefit of another man without any return. It may be grand larceny, or it may be petty larceny; but there is very little difference between the two in principle. The command, "Thou shalt not steal," applies equally to both, and Mr. Roosevelt, as an honest man, ought to be able to see this.

### HEALTH AT HOME.

For the great majority, the opening of school means the end of summer, and with summer goes not only holiday, but what is more important, and certainly more healthful, fresh air goes also.

We have hurried so fast in America to build marble hotels and steam-heated apartment houses that now we are just beginning to learn how much we have struggled to gain that which was not worth while. The abounding sense of strength and happiness which only good health can give, depends in theory and in practice on fresh air more than any other one thing that experience or science has shown to be valuable. Despite President Taft's idea that a three months' vacation is necessary, the average man does mightily well if he gets two weeks, and no one in his full senses would desire to turn his whole life into an unending search for rest.

The two great joys of the summer outing are novelty and the sense of physical well-being, but if only we will follow simple and obvious rules good health may be better found at home.

Novelty is sometimes a hard matter to find on the familiar and beaten round, but health and strength often eat it at our very doors. Does a man fear a cold? He need not go to Colorado or Saranac. Safety, and we almost say immunity, may be found in Richmond, for it is not the cold air or winter that brings the snuffling, sneezing, coughing and all that catarrhal train that precedes gripe, and only too often pneumonia and death. It is the foul air of the offices and

homes and street cars that nourishes and spreads these painful and deadly germs.

One hundred years ago we were a nation of hardy farmers and woodsmen; to-day we are a nation of dwellers in steam-heated flats. We have thrown away the heritage of fresh air, sunlight and open country, and we are paying for it in sickness, decreased vitality, and shortened lives.

The health department of the city of Richmond, by its vigor and intelligence, has practically banished typhoid fever. The citizens of Richmond, by their energy and wisdom, can banish bad air and its attendant ills.

### VOTE AGAINST THEM ALL.

The Virginian-Pilot, originally not opposed to all of the proposed amendments to the Constitution of Virginia, at last has taken a position identical with that of this paper in opposing all of them. Our contemporary says:

In view, however, of the campaign, especially the character of the campaign, which the Treasurers and Commissioners of Revenue are making to effect ratification of the two amendments in which they are directly and peculiarly interested, it would probably be wiser not to confuse the issue in the public mind by advocating ratification in one instance and opposing it in the others. The best way to insure that the amendments which ought to be defeated will be killed is to vote against them all.

That is just the point we have been hammering on for many the long day. Not for one moment have we considered that all these four propositions were of equal rank in vicious effect upon good government. In our opinion, the two amendments relating to the city and county treasurers and commissioners of the revenue are vastly more pernicious than the other two suggested changes. The fourth proposed amendment aiming at the simplification of legislative procedure would make no far-reaching change in the reading of bills in the General Assembly and, if it stood by itself, would, with no public disaster were it to become law.

Confusion of these issues is greatly to be dreaded and avoided. Widespread ignorance as to the purpose of these four proposed amendments exists in every part of this Commonwealth, and any attempt to urge voters to vote one way on three of the changes and the opposite way on the remaining one will simply make "confusion worse confounded." It is too late to try to mark off a middle ground between opposition of all the amendments and advocacy of all of them. The question is: shall the proposed amendments pass or shall they fail?

If there were any public demand for one or two of these changes and no such demand for the remainder, the matter would be put in a different light. But such is not the case. There is no public demand for any of these changes.

The truth of the matter is that a great number of voters do not know anything about these proposed amendments, and are just beginning to show a mild curiosity as to what the changes are about. The cry for these alterations in our organic law did not originate with the people, and these changes have been brought to the attention of the people only by the press of the State in sporadic instances, as a general thing. From the hour of their birth in the Capitol until now, these proposed amendments have kept "the noiseless tenor of their way," and a great many voters are still unaware of the existence of them.

These proposed amendments stand or fall together. The question is indivisible. Popular ignorance of these four propositions negatives the idea that it is reasonable to vote for some and vote against others. As the Virginian-Pilot well says, "The best way to insure that the amendments which ought to be defeated will be killed is to vote against them all."

Vote against them all. That is the simplest, the easiest, the safest and the best thing that the voters of Virginia can do at the polls on the eighth day of November next.

The Virginian-Pilot says: "What's the use of mushroom communities like New York and Kentucky posing as birthplaces of the julep? Shakespeare refers to it as an English institution old even in his time."

This is a most disloyal utterance, tending to make us believe that our Norfolk contemporary has been broadening so much over "the new nationalism" that it has absorbed some of that ism's "active principle." We concur as to Kentucky and New York—but no farther. The mint julep was born in Old Virginia, and has been concocted here since colonial days. Shakespeare knew the julep—not the mint julep. The "cordial julep" that Milton and Massinger and the Bard of Avon were acquainted with was simply a sweet drink, with a dash of spirits, mayhap, but with no suggestion of the fragrant mint, without which a julep is worse than water.

The mint julep is a Virginia product, and only the witchcraft of a Virginia hand can concoct it. Shakespeare gaped a julep that was the prototype of the modern orange phosphate. Pallas, whom some believe to have been St. Patrick, in the year 450 wrote of the green springs of "mynte," but it remained for a Virginian to blend the julep and the mint in mellow harmony. Who he was we know not, but they are legion who hold him in happy memory.

Evidently all the preachers are not poverty-stricken. A Richmond weaver of the black cloth met the editor of the Farmville Herald on the streets of Farmville last week and said to him: "Come to Richmond, and I will give you a large room, and feed you on choice beefsteak."

"Good-bye, apple-jack," says an exchange. Why good-bye? The apple crop this year is to be greater than in many years, they say.

## Daily Queries and Answers

Address all communications for this column to Query Editor, Times-Dispatch. No mathematical problems will be solved, no coins or stamps valued and no dealers' names will be given.

**"Bleeding Kansas."**  
Why is Kansas spoken of as "bleeding Kansas?" A. W. A. Because of the blood shed in the period of its early Statehood, over the admission of slavery to Kansas.

**"The House by the Side of the Road."**  
Where can one find a little poem, "The House by the Side of the Road?" A. A scholarship bought in a college, how long is it available? Is it transferable? SUBSCRIBER. 1. Write to Sam Walter Foss, care Boston Herald, Boston Mass., who will send you a copy. 2. It depends upon the rules of the institution.

**Adoption of Child by Alien.**  
Will you kindly answer the following through your paper: 1. Is it allowed to adopt an American child? 2. If the court, not knowing that the applicant is alien, grants adoption papers, are the papers valid? ALIEN.

1. Yes. 2. Yes.

**Trade of Silver Smith.**  
How long will it take a young man to learn the trade of a silver smith? That depends upon the amount of interest the young man takes in the work. Under favorable circumstances, about four years.

**Shall and Will.**  
Please explain the distinction between "shall" and "will." "Shall" indicates a duty or necessity whose obligation is derived from the person speaking, as "I shall go." "Will" indicates a wish or intention, as "I will go." In the second and third persons.

## GREAT BRITAIN'S NEW ASTRONOMER

BY LIA MARQUISE DE PONTENAY.  
GREAT BRITAIN'S new astronomer royal is Frank Watson Dyson, Fellow of the Royal Society, and one of the last five years astronomer of Scotland, and professor of astronomy at the Edinburgh University. On the 1st of October he takes the place of the late Sir William Christie at Greenwich, where he will be in charge of the Royal Observatory. He is the son of a naval officer, and was educated at the Bradford Grammar School and at Trinity College, Cambridge.

His office of astronomer royal dates from the reign of King Charles II, who created it at the instance of his sailor brother, the Duke of York, and his son, James II. The latter, it may be remembered, was Lord High Admiral of the realm prior to his accession to the throne. As a practical sailor he was keenly alive to the necessity of a national observatory, and in order to take proper observations at sea mariners must have good tables of the moon and other celestial bodies. He consulted James Flamsteed, the leading astronomer of his day and the friend of Newton, and his suggestion his brother, Charles II, brought into existence the observatory at Greenwich in 1675, appointing Flamsteed as astronomer royal at the magnificent salary of £100 a year. He was succeeded in the office as astronomer royal by Edmund Halley, who gave his name to the famous comet that has been rendered responsible for every solar eclipse since his death, and during the past two years. The post is now worth some \$8,000 a year, and carries with it a handsome pension.

It is under the rules of the latter, which require retirement on a pension of £4,000 a year, and no officer may be appointed after the age of sixty, that Sir William Christie is leaving office at the age of sixty-two, and his place is being taken by the younger astronomer royal for twenty-nine years, which is about the average length of each astronomer royal's tenure of the post. All of them, however, have been star gazing in conducive to good health and longevity.

There has been so much discussion of late in the press on both sides of the Atlantic as to the role which the Netherlands would be called upon to play in the event of a war between England and Germany, that it seems odd that the name of the astronomer royal should have been mentioned in connection with the defense of Holland, namely that of cutting the dikes. The dikes are the great barrier between the whole stretch of country, from Naarden, on the Zuider Zee by Utrecht, to the Meuse, and the great water works of the Netherlands, which have been made in that connection of the principle of the defense of Holland, namely that of cutting the dikes.

When William of Orange flooded the country in 1574, and by so doing drove out the Spanish invaders, it was this which was done was relatively crude and slow; whereas the development of the science of hydraulic engineering and the invention of the dredging machine, which has enabled the government of Queen Wilhelmina to inaugurate devices which would make the dikes almost impregnable and fortified against the sea, has been in connection therewith the chief state secret of Holland, and the crown prince, Robert, of which her independence may be said to rest. It is a secret which is shared by two members of the cabinet, namely, the Minister of the Interior, and the Minister of the Waterstaat, the latter of whom has charge of the very important work of maintaining the dikes and canals with which the Netherlands are intersected in every direction.

## THE COST OF ROOSEVELTISM

The total expenditures of the United States government from the inauguration of Washington in 1789 to the beginning of the Civil War in 1861 were \$1,795,273,344.14.

The appropriation bills signed by Theodore Roosevelt during his second term in the White House, from March 4, 1905, to March 4, 1909, authorized expenditures amounting to \$3,522,982,816.87.

Four years of Rooseveltism cost twice as much as the first seventy-two years of the Republic!

One term of Theodore Roosevelt took twice as much money out of the pockets of the American people as the combined terms of Washington, Adams, Jefferson, Madison, Monroe, John Quincy Adams, Jackson, Van Buren, Harrison, Tyler, Polk, Taylor, Fillmore, Pierce and Buchanan.

During the seventy-two years covered by the administrations of these fifteen Presidents the United States government paid the Revolutionary War debt incurred by the States. It paid the cost of the War of 1812. It paid the cost of the Mexican War. It bought Louisiana. It bought Florida. It paid for the Gadsden Purchase. It acquired all that vast extent of territory from the Mississippi River to the Pacific Ocean.

What have the American people got to show for the four years of Rooseveltism which cost double the money?

And what would be the cost of four years more of Roosevelt under the New Nationalism?—The New York World.

## DR. VESTAL GETS FULL SECTICE FOR AT AN END

High Point Physician Must Serve Ten Years for Causing Death of Woman.

[Special to The Times-Dispatch.] Greensboro, N. C., September 23.—The trial of Dr. W. L. Vestal, a prominent physician of High Point, charged with first degree murder by causing the death of a young woman named Bessie Thomason from an operation which he performed, came to an abrupt end in Guilford Superior Court this morning. Upon the reassembling of court, Ex-Judge W. P. Bynum, Jr., of counsel for the defense, arose and announced that the defense recognized in any event the jury might find the defendant guilty of manslaughter, though they felt they could secure an acquittal in this case, but even then there was staring the defendant in the face the case of May Owen, in which another charge was made, the penalty for which was equal to that for manslaughter. Therefore he entered a plea of guilty of manslaughter in the case of Bessie Thomason, and asked that Mrs. Vestal be liberated.

After Gattis then prayed judgment in the case of manslaughter, the maximum punishment for which is ten years in the penitentiary, and that judgment in the May Owen case be suspended and Mrs. Vestal set free. Pleas for mercy were made by Ex-Judge Bynum, Colonel Wesscott, Robinson, John T. Benbow and Ex-Judge R. C. Strudwick, of counsel for the defense, urging the court to be lenient in passing sentence. County Attorney John M. Heuser, L. C. Caldwell and Solicitor Gattis opposed the plea of leniency and urged that the limit of the law be given the defendant. In pronouncing sentence upon Dr. Vestal Judge Lyon stated that this was the worst case he had ever had to deal with since going on the bench; that he felt sorry for Dr. Vestal and for his wife and loved ones and the father of the dead girl, but that the beginning of this business in the State of North Carolina, must be stopped, and he sentenced the defendant to the limit, ten years at hard labor in the State prison, which sentence met with the approval of the solicitor and the other counsel for the prosecution.

On what day of the week did September 21, 1871, fall? Thursday.

Sixty veterans of the War between the States from Columbus, O., will be in Richmond next week, returning from the reunion of Northern veterans at Atlantic City. They form a touring party, headed by a former Union soldier, there to take boat for Norfolk. On Tuesday evening they will land here after a boat trip up the James and will remain overnight in the city, when a Chesapeake and Ohio train will be boarded for the trip to their homes. The party will stop at the Lexington Hotel.

Sergeant J. D. Roderer, of Bristol, Va., who was yesterday having brought a prisoner to Laurel Reformatory. It will be the sergeant's duty, when the prisoner is released, to return him to his home in Bristol, Va., for shooting two members of his own duck race.

## URGES VOTERS TO SUPPORT STUART

Senator Swanson Makes Two Strong Speeches in Wythe County.

Wytheville, Va., September 23.—On Thursday afternoon at Ivanhoe, a beautiful mining town on New River, in Wythe county, Senator Claude A. Swanson addressed an enthusiastic audience, variously estimated at from 200 to 300 people, in behalf of the candidacy of H. C. Stuart for Congress from this district. He was introduced by H. M. Heuser, a prominent Wytheville attorney. The Senator's speech was a masterly exposition of the frauds and fallacies of the Payne-Aldrich tariff bill. He not only explained in a most effective way the discriminations made in favor of the classes and against the masses in this bill, but he also showed by a number of individual cases that even the reductions claimed to have been made, in fact, benefited the consumer. His arraignment of this bill, for which Mr. Slomp, a prominent lawyer, was acting as counsel, was being repudiated, even by Republicans, and defeated at home, and the further fact that stand-patters like Mr. McKinlay, of California, who is now stumpng for Mr. Slomp, have been discredited and defeated at home and have nothing to do now but to make stump speeches for his few fellow stand-patters, who are now being attached to the service of his government. In the late reign it was Lord Russell, and since George V. has come to the throne it is Lord Wenlock.

Lord Torrington's ancestral home, Yates Court, in Kent, is now rented, and is being used as a residence for a French family. The court has no alternative but to sentence him to death on this count, and the court, who recommended him to mercy, George V. declined to listen to a word in his behalf, and the admiral was shot down by a file of marines on the quarter deck of his own flagship in Portsmouth.

The first Lord Torrington was Admiral Sir George Byng, so famous for his victory over the Spaniards, and who was another son of Robert Byng, Governor of Barbados, the Earl of Stratford are descended. The second Lord Torrington was a member, married the widow of Samuel Colgate, of New York, who was Miss Clara Smith, of New Orleans. (Copyright, 1910, by the Brentwood Company.)

He closed with a handsome tribute to the rugged integrity and worth of H. C. Stuart, and told the voters that they could not go wrong by voting for him. He was the most attentive listener at any of the Republican rallies, and they showed their appreciation by smiles of approval.

Senator Swanson made his second speech in Wythe county at Wytheville on Friday afternoon, September 23. He was introduced by J. A. Powell. A number of women were present, and the Senator was greeted with rounds of applause not only when he was introduced, but throughout his speech. He is a great favorite of the Wythe people, and they are always anxious for an opportunity to show their admiration for him.

He proceeded along somewhat the same lines as in his Ivanhoe speech, but perhaps elaborating more. He showed that the Payne-Aldrich bill was a fraud, and that the high protective tariff as fostered and maintained by the Republican party, and the methods by which it was added upon the people of this country. He showed that Mr. Slomp, a stand-patter, who was now being attached to the service of his government, was being repudiated, even by Republicans, and they showed their appreciation by smiles of approval.

Senator Swanson goes from Wytheville to Giles county, where he will make several speeches, and then he will be in the western portion of the State. He shows his old-time vigor and force, and will do yeoman service for Stuart and the cause of Democracy.

## Make this Bank Your Bank.

National State and City Bank

OF RICHMOND, VA.

Capital . . . \$1,000,000.00  
Surplus . . . \$ 600,000.00

WM. H. PALMER, President.  
JOHN E. BELL, Vice-President.  
WM. M. HILL, Vice-President.  
J. W. SINTON, Vice-President.  
JULIAN H. HILL, Cashier.  
Three per cent. per annum interest allowed on Savings Deposits, compounded every six months.